DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 234 029 SP 022 961

AUTHOR O'Neal, Sharon; Edwards, Sara

TITLE The Supervision of Student Teaching.
INSTITUTION Texas Univ., Austin. Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.
REPORT NO RDCTE-9045
PUB DATE Apr 83
NOTE 43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (Montreal, Canada, April 11-15, 1983).
AVAILABLE FROM Research & Development Center for Teacher Education, Education Annex 3.203, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX 78712 ($1.75).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Cooperating Teachers; Helping Relationship; Higher Education; Interpersonal Relationship; Preservice Teacher Education; Student Attitudes; Student Evaluation; *Student Teacher Relationship; *Student Teaching; Supervisory Methods; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Characteristics; Teacher Influence; *Teacher Supervision
IDENTIFIERS Texas

ABSTRACT

Selected findings from a major investigation of preservice clinical teacher education are presented, focusing on the supervision of 20 student teachers by their cooperating teachers. Participants completed background questionnaires, responded to five evaluation questionnaires, kept journals, audiotaped their supervisory conferences, and participated in interviews. They were also observed in their classrooms periodically over the semester. A summary is presented of the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data gathered in the study, and a description is provided of supervisory conferences conducted by students and cooperating teachers. Findings and conclusions which focus on the supervision and feedback interactions between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher were extracted from three case studies. Conferences appeared to be dominated by the cooperating teachers, and most talk was classified as comment which dealt with classroom events or student teaching activities. Participants tended to discuss teaching rather than the organization of student teaching, or subjects that were outside the teaching realm. Recommendations are made for further research on supervision of student teachers. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

SP

Research and Development Center for Teacher Education

The University of Texas at Austin

Austin, Texas 78712

ED234029

THE SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHING

Sharon O'Neal & Sara Edwards

Report No. 9045

Paper prepared for the Annual Meeting of the
American Educational Research Association
Montreal, 1983

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. H. Bown

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Gary A. Griffin, Program Director

April 1983

SP022961

THE SUPERVISION OF STUDENT TEACHING

Introduction

In the fall of 1981 the Research in Teacher Education (RITE) program area of the Research and Development Center for Teacher Education at The University of Texas at Austin conducted a major investigation of preservice clinical teacher education. The overall purpose of the study (Griffin, et al., Note 1) was to make available an in-depth description of participants, practices, and outcomes of the student teaching experience in two settings. Data were collected on the characteristics, behaviors, and perceptions of the individuals; on the requirements, directives, and regulations of the institutions; and on the results of these factors meeting and acting on each other. The data were analyzed from several perspectives, one of which--the supervision of student teaching--provides the focus for this paper.

The purpose of this paper is to present selected findings of the study from the perspective of the supervision of student teaching. Two approaches are combined in an effort to provide a more comprehensive description of the interactions and perceptions of the participants. One approach produced a description of supervisory conferences of 20 student teachers and their cooperating teachers. For a detailed report of this analysis and description, the reader is referred to O'Neal (Note 2). The second approach examined the student teaching experience from the inside out, using three case studies. The complete case studies are presented in a RITE report (Edwards, Note 3).

Rationale

Supervision is central to the student teaching experience. Although major roles and responsibilities are delineated, and evaluation and reporting are directed through institutional documents and protocols, individuals with their particular characteristics fill the roles and implement the programs.

How those individuals provide feedback to student teachers throughout the course of their training may be a critical variable in the success or failure of their clinical experience. Southall and King (1979) found, in their study of student teaching, that cooperating teachers and student teachers identified lack of communication as their most frequent problem. Because communication is central to the supervision and instruction of student teachers it is therefore worthy of close examination.

Organization

This paper will first provide a methodology section which will summarize the analysis of both quantitative and qualitative data. Secondly, a description of supervisory conferences conducted by student teachers and their cooperating teachers will be provided. Then an overview of the three case studies will be presented. Finally, conclusions will be discussed.

Methodology

Sample Description

The complete sample for the RITE study included 88 cooperating teachers, 93 student teachers, and 17 university supervisors for a total of 198 participants from two sites. At each site university supervisors, principals and others were asked to identify 10 "effective" cooperating teachers. These cooperating teachers (10 at each site) and the student teachers and university supervisors with whom they worked composed the subsample (20 cooperating teachers, 20 student teachers, nine university supervisors) which was subjected to more extensive and intensive investigation. This study will focus on information obtained from the intensive sample.

Procedures

As part of the major investigation, participants completed background questionnaires at the beginning of the student teaching experience and

self-administered five instruments at the beginning, middle, and end of the student teaching experience. These instruments included the Educational Preference Scale (Lacefield & Cole, Note 4), Teacher Concerns Questionnaire (Fuller, 1969), Rigidity-Flexibility Index (Hughes, Griffin, & Defino, Note 5), Internal-External Locus of Control (MacDonald & Tseng, Note 6), and the Self-Perception Inventory (Soares & Soares, 1968). Two other measures, Paragraph Completion (Hunt, Greenwood, Noy, & Watson, Note 7) and Empathy Construct Scale (LaMonica, Note 8), were completed only at the beginning and end of the semester. The Quick Word Test (Borgatta & Corsini, 1960) was self-administered only at the start of the semester while the Teacher Work-Life Inventory (Blumberg & Kleinke, Note 9) was administered only at the end of the semester. Participants also kept journals, audiotaped their supervisory conferences, and participated in beginning, middle and end of semester interviews. Participants were observed in their classrooms three or four times, over the course of the semester.

Complementing the more comprehensive statistical view, the case studies provide a view of idiosyncratic aspects of the student teaching experience as it is shaped by the individual characteristics of the participants in interaction within a specific context.

Analysis of Data

The data sources for this paper were qualitative and quantitative in nature. To describe the supervision of student teachers in the intensive sample, 76 audiotapes of supervisory conferences between cooperating teachers and their student teachers were analyzed. To provide information for the selected case studies, individual interviews, journals, and self-administered quantitative instruments were examined in addition to conferences.

Quantitative instruments were used to assess the personal reference points of each member of the dyad.

With regard to conference data, tapes were first transcribed and then coded using a variation of Weller's (1971) MOSAIC system of analysis. This coding system was developed to provide information about the process and the content of the conferences. In terms of process, the coding focused upon describing the exchange of information between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher. Who did the talking, to whom the talk was directed, and what type of talking occurred were described. In terms of content, the nature of the topics discussed in the conferences was examined. Three major categories were included under content: "teaching," "organization of student teaching," and "other," An overview of all categories is provided in Figure 1.

With case studies, each journal, interview and conference was examined individually and summarized. Summaries noted the following: (1) least frequently occurring themes; (2) most frequently occurring themes; and, (3) differences in themes across role types (i.e., student teacher and cooperating teacher). These qualitative data coupled with information obtained from the quantitative instruments were the basis for the discussion of each of the three student teacher-cooperating teacher dyads.

Supervisory Conferences

Conferences were examined in terms of both the process of the communication taking place as well as the content. With regard to process, who did the talking and what type of talking occurred were described.

Process

As the process data in Table 1 indicate, cooperating teachers tended to dominate the interactions in conferences. A mean total of 330.45 lines of

Figure 1

Coding Categories Used in the

Analysis of Conference Data

Statement Number	Number of Lines	Process			Content													
					Teaching										Organization of Teaching		Not Applicable
					Generality		Focus				Domain						
		Who	Type	Direction	Classroom-Specific	General	Objectives	Methods and Materials	Execution and Instructional Interactions	Other	Cognitive	Affective	Social-Disciplinary	Other	Student Teaching Protocol	Student Teaching Activities	
5																	

Table 1

Cooperating Teacher-Student Teacher

Conference "Talk"

	Cooperating Teacher	Student Teacher	Total
Mean Number of Lines* per Conference	229.86	100.59	330.45
Mean Percentage of Talk by Participant per Conference	71.89	28.11	100.00

* "Lines" refers to the typed lines of a transcribed conference. An average count of 12 words appeared in each typed line of conference data.

type were transcribed for each conference. Of these 330 lines, cooperating teachers spoke approximately 72% of them, while student teachers uttered 28%. Because these conferences were dyadic in nature, the direction of the interaction was assumed (i.e., when a cooperating teacher spoke, his/her statement was directed toward the student teacher and vice versa).

Fourteen categories were used to describe the type of talk that occurred. Data describing the type of talk are displayed in Table 2. Examination of the cooperating teachers' talk showed that the most frequently occurring type was "review." More specifically, the cooperating teacher was coded as interacting by reviewing or commenting on classroom events or student teaching activities more often than any other type of interaction.

The cooperating teachers reviewed or commented on classroom events in approximately 37% of the mean total of typed lines. The second most frequently occurring type of cooperating teacher behavior was "direction giving." Cooperating teachers gave their student teachers specific directions regarding instruction in approximately 21% of typed lines. The least frequently occurring type of cooperating teacher statement was "acknowledgment or endorsement." This type of statement contained little information and consisted of the teacher providing his/her partner with a remark such as "yes," "right," "fine," etc. Cooperating teachers' typed lines were classified as acknowledgments in approximately 3% of their statements.

On the other hand, student teachers' statements were classified as acknowledgments in almost 24% of their typed lines. However, student teachers proved to be like their cooperating teachers in that the majority of their talk focused on classroom events. Approximately 32% of the student teachers'

Table 2
Process Data From Cooperating Teacher-
Student Teacher Conferences

		Type of Comment**								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Cooperating Teacher	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	46	12.01	15.56	81.91	16.79	23.41	6.03	*	26.86
	Mean Percentage	21.20	7.24	8.29	35.79	5.95	10.17	2.79	*	7.36
Student Teacher	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	*	*	1.88	20.95	*	15.68	19.76	7.70	23.32
	Mean Percentage	*	*	4.35	32.41	*	18.65	23.50	9.12	9.86

* Blank cells indicate that the code was not used for that participant.

** Types of comments:
1. Gives directions
2. Asks about interests
3. Provides evaluative feedback
4. Reviews or comments on classroom events or student teaching events
5. Provides options
6. Describes interests and concerns
7. Acknowledgement
8. Offers suggestions
9. Other

statements dealt with the review of classroom events or student teaching activities. The least frequently occurring type of student teacher interactions were those coded as "evaluation."

Content

In addition to classifying conference information as to the process of the interaction, conference statements were also analyzed with regard to what was said. Three major categories emerged when the content of conferences was examined; Teaching, The Organization of Student Teaching, and Other. All statements that referred to the classroom teaching experience were included in the teaching category. The Organization of Student Teaching included all statements that referred to the training and supervision of student teachers. As the data in Table 3 indicate, the majority of all conferences focused on Teaching as opposed to The Organization of Student Teaching. On the average, 79.11% of each conference focused on teaching while 18.42% focused on the organization of student teaching.

Table 4 summarizes content information across all conferences by participant. As is evident from the data displayed in Table 4, when cooperating teachers' and student teachers' talk was examined separately no substantial differences were noted. For the most part, talk about teaching events occurred most often. In approximately 80% of all statements cooperating teachers focused on teaching events. Approximately 75% of the student teachers' statements dealt with teaching. The teaching category was broken down into three subcategories; "generality", "focus", and "domain". Codings under the generality category indicated whether the teaching events discussed were specific to the immediate classroom and student teaching experience or were more general in nature.

Table 3
Content Data From Cooperating Teacher/
Student Teacher Conferences--All Participants

	Teaching	Organization of Student Teaching	Not Applicable
All Participants (i.e., Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers)	*79.11%	18.42%	8.12%

*Percentages equal more than 100% because the "Teaching" category and the "Organization of Student Teaching" category were not mutually exclusive.

Table 4

Content Data From Cooperating Teacher/

Student Teacher Conference by Participants

	Teaching	Organization of Student Teaching	Other
Cooperating Teacher	*80.06%	18.33%	7.61%
Student Teacher	74.53%	20.00%	10.17%

*Percentages equal more than 100% because the "Teaching" category and the "Organization of Student Teaching" category were not mutually exclusive.

The focus category analyzed interactions for information dealing with instructional content and objectives, methods and materials, or the actual execution of the lesson. Statements coded as methods and materials dealt with the materials of instruction and/or those strategic operations designed to achieve objectives. The subcategory "execution of lessons" focused on instructional interactions between the teacher, pupils and content or curriculum.

The third category determined what domain the instructional interaction focused upon (i.e. cognitive, affective, or social/disciplinary). The instructional domain was adapted from Bloom (Bloom, et al., 1956). Typed lines coded as pertaining to the cognitive domain focused on cognition, knowledge, understanding and learning. The cognitive domain was here restricted to cognitive interactions between pupils and subject matter.

As the data in Table 5 indicate, all participants tended to be highly specific when discussing teaching events. Typed lines were specific in approximately 91% of all statements dealing with teaching events. In addition, most teaching interactions focused on the methods and materials of instruction. Approximately 49% of each conference focused on the methods and materials of the teaching event, approximately 28% of each conference focused on instructional interactions and execution, while 18% of the conference time was devoted to the content and objectives of the teaching events being discussed. Less than 6% of the data in this area dealt with a different focus than those stipulated. When the third subcategory, domain, was examined, mean frequencies indicated that cooperating teachers and student teachers tended to be most concerned with the cognitive domain. Concerns with the cognitive domain were addressed more often in instructional conversations dealing with teaching events than the other dimensions of instructional domain (i.e.

Table 5

Content Data from Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher Conferences Dealing with Teaching - Mean Number of Typed Lines and Percentages for All Participants*

		Generality		Focus				Domain			
		1*	2	1**	2	3	4	1***	2	3	4
All Participants (i.e., Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers	Mean Frequency of Occurrence	211.06	31.83	41.42	126.23	63.36	12.41	155.32	6.86	58.91	22.14
	Mean Percentage	90.71	9.29	18.45	49.20	27.53	5.12	69.14	3.41	21.42	6.12

Note that percentages may not total to 100 due to rounding error.

Categories

* 1. specific statements
2. general statements

** 1. content and objectives
2. materials and methods
3. execution
4. other

*** 1. cognitive
2. affective
3. social/disciplinary
4. other

affective and social/disciplinary). Talk dealing with the cognitive domain dominated 69% of the teaching event statements whereas approximately 21% of all teaching conversations addressed social/disciplinary concerns. The least frequently addressed area within instructional domain was the affective domain. Only 3% of the teaching event statements dealt with concerns in the affective domain.

In addition to examining the content of the cooperating teacher-student teacher conversations in terms of teaching, these conversations were also examined for talk about the organization of the student teaching experience. All statements that referred to the training and supervision of the student teacher were included in this category and were coded in terms of "protocol" and "activities".

Protocol included all information about the structure, formal procedures, and the administration of student teaching. Activities included all information about events in which the student teacher participated. Table 6 summarizes the conference data categorized as dealing with the organization of teaching.

As the data in Table 6 indicate, when the organization of student teaching was addressed, participants usually focused on the protocols of student teaching. Approximately 81% of the typed lines dealing with the organization of student teaching were devoted to the protocols of student teaching. The activities of student teaching were discussed in 13% of these typed lines. When the content of the student teachers' and the cooperating teachers' conversations were examined individually, a similar pattern emerged.

Table 6
Content Data from Cooperating Teacher/Student Teacher Conferences Dealing with the Organization of Student Teaching - Mean Numbers of Typed Lines and Percentages for All Participants

		Activities	Protocol
All Participants (i.e., Cooperating Teachers and Student Teachers	Mean Frequency of Occurrence Per Conference	6.80*	48.24
	Mean Percentages Per Conference	13.29	80.64

*Note that percentages do not add to 100% because they are the averages for all conferences; i.e., each conference contributed equally to the average regardless of each conference's duration.

Summary

Audiotaped conferences between cooperating teachers and student teachers were transcribed and analyzed in terms of the process and the content of the communication.

Conferences between student teachers and their cooperating teachers were dominated by the cooperating teacher. In addition most talk, whether it was initiated by the cooperating teacher or the student teacher, was classified as comments which dealt with classroom events or with student teaching activities. Cooperating teachers also spent approximately 20% of the conference time giving directions to their student teachers. Student teachers spent about the same amount of time simply acknowledging what the cooperating teacher had said. Student teachers and cooperating teachers rarely made evaluative remarks.

When the content of the talk from the conferences was analyzed all participants tended to spend time discussing teaching rather than the organization of student teaching or subjects that were outside the teaching realm. An average of 79.11% of all statements per conference were categorized as discussing teaching, whereas 18.42% of the statements dealt with the organization of student teaching and 8.12% were classified as not applicable to teaching. When the content of the conferences was examined for each participant, individuals did not vary from the pattern established as a group.

For the category "teaching," most statements in the conferences were specific in nature, dealing with the materials and methods of teaching and focusing on the cognitive domain. Again, when participants were examined by role (i.e., cooperating teacher and student teacher) they did not deviate substantially from the group patterns. The category "organization of student teaching" was also broken down. Approximately 81% of all statements concerned

with the organization of student teaching, dealt with protocols, whereas 13% of all statements were devoted to the activities of student teaching. Once again, when participants were examined by role, similar trends were noted.

Case Studies

Three student teaching triads were analyzed from a case study approach. Findings and conclusions which focus on the supervision and feedback interactions between the student teacher and the cooperating teacher were extracted from the case studies for presentation in this paper.

Case Study #1

From their first meeting both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher emphasized and stressed their perception of a mutual relationship of "equals" with responsibilities for contributing to the development and support of the students in the classroom. They moved together, initiating, reacting, encouraging, supporting and reinforcing patterns of classroom behavior mutually viewed as good teaching which they believed would lead to or result in "right outcomes" in students.

The student teacher seemed to view the relationship with the cooperating teacher as one of commitment, trust, security or predictability, and intimacy. These perceptions appeared to be related to responsible risk-taking and introspective critical analysis. The student teacher saw the cooperating teacher as a great influence in her field experience.

In the official evaluations of the student teacher by the cooperating teacher all factors were marked with the highest possible numerical rating. The cooperating teacher listed three specific accomplishments: (1) provided individual assignments; (2) kept track of what was going on; and, (3) saw that students completed assignments. The remainder of the evaluation enumerated

these more general characteristics of the student teacher: (1) enthusiastic; (2) hardworking; (3) friendly; (4) flexible; (5) sense of humor; (6) wonderful perspective about teaching; and (7) positive manner. The narrative concluded with the notation that student teacher was "terrific."

Their personal reactions were equally positive: the cooperating teacher wrote in her journal after their first meeting "we're going to get along perfectly;" the student teacher recorded "as soon as we were introduced I took an intense liking to her... I'm so lucky to have been placed with her." The cooperating teacher attributed two characteristics to the student teacher: ambition (she has several part-time jobs) and being up-front (she asked to set up compensatory time in order to have additional vacation time). The student teacher mentioned the "sincerity, down-to-earthness, vitality and honesty of the cooperating teacher, and labeled her "dedicated, open, assertive, honest and extremely friendly." Both journal entries and interviews provide evidence that this mutual admiration continued throughout the clinical experience.

The student teacher reported that the cooperating teacher told her that the two of them would be "equals," and that the student teacher would be the primary teacher when a substitute was present. The student teacher returned to this theme of "equality" continually throughout the experience, explaining, defining, elaborating, defending, and equating it to having "responsibility" which she stated "will really be the best learning experience."

When asked about her role, the cooperating teacher said that she needed to be supportive of the student teacher and foster the feeling that the cooperating teacher and student teacher are working together toward the same end, but each in a different way, because "there are different points of view ...different ways of doing things and those are okay." This perception, acted out in her relations with the student teacher, gave the student teacher

support and opportunity for experimentation and risk-taking, but the absence of any context for analysis and evaluation left the student teacher dependent on the cooperating teacher's reaction and her own feelings for decision making and action. Instruction, to the student teacher, meant "things are going on" and "getting done" in a relatively quiet environment where the control is not "total" to the point that students feel fear, where some "social interaction takes place during work time." This perception was evident in the continuing concern expressed by the student teacher throughout the semester that the students have "something to do" at all times. Both student teacher and cooperating teacher apparently agreed that all students must be "doing something" at all times and there was an ongoing concern expressed that enough "somethings" be available to fill class time. There was a lack of clarity regarding ends-in-view of the "somethings," or even of the process of perpetual activity; there was a groping, situation-specific approach to the development and preparation of activities, and a constant pressure to keep using more out-of-class time to "get things ready" to do in class.

Throughout the period of the study the cooperating teacher continually stressed that her decisions regarding both content and process of teaching were determined by her assessment of the needs of the learners. This assertion was modified by one exception. In the first interview she explained that content of her instruction accommodated school expectations and/or requirements. The example she gave was the reading curriculum. The school required the use of the Houghton-Mifflin "stuff," she said. However, the cooperating teacher only "infiltrates" it into her own curriculum in order to avoid having a student reach the next grade and "apparently look like he or she didn't do anything in reading because he/she didn't use Houghton-Mifflin...You can teach science, music, those kinds of things with

anything, even reading--you don't need a specific series or a specific unit. It's processing. I'm very process-oriented and the content is of very, very little consequence to me," the cooperating teacher reported to the interviewer at the beginning of the student teaching experience.

In an interview conducted at mid-semester, the student teacher reported success with conducting class "activities" but expressed difficulty in knowing what the kids needed to be learning. She still had to get specific directions from the cooperating teacher: "Work with these kids on these skills," in order to make lesson plans. "I don't know what skills they really need to be working on...it's really hard for me to know if they should be working with contractions or whatever...I guess I don't know enough about education or teachers' workbooks." The cooperating teacher substantiated this notion that the instructional skills of student teachers are limited and insufficient in her first interview. "I don't sense that they see the whole curriculum."

The cooperating teacher reported she did very little formal observation of the student teacher. When the student teacher conducted a lesson the cooperating teacher "got out of her way" and "worked with children." The cooperating teacher reported that she told the student teacher that "seeing" is important. "One of the things we are working on right now is for the student teacher to be aware of the whole room." According to the cooperating teacher, a teacher must be able to sense when it is too noisy in some area of the classroom or when some learning activity is inappropriate or a child is not doing something he has been told to do. "It is essential," she stated, "to find ways to stop for a moment without interrupting a lesson, finding the right time to stop and slide out and slide back...that is part of the management of an informal classroom." As an aside: a RITE observer described the management system as "chaos," with kids "all over the place, some of whom

argue, dance, leap into walls or wander aimlessly about, apparently unobserved by the cooperating teacher and student teacher."

About class control the cooperating teacher wrote in her journal, "The children settled down...since I was very strict, but they played every number they could devise (on the student teacher)...I would really be angry to see them behave for one person and knowing they could do it, misbehave for me!" The next week she reported "The children are high this week and (student teacher) and I are both keeping them calm! The student teacher really learned a lot from her all day teaching." (Author's underlining.) What she had learned, the student teacher reported, was that "I had to be stricter as the children began to take advantage of me. I hate raising my voice but know I must."

Case Study #2

The experience of dyad #2 might well be presented as a three months Basic Training course in crowd control. The cooperating teacher was the soft-hearted but business first, by-the-book sergeant; and the student teacher the well-meaning, bumbling, good ol' raw recruit.

The cooperating teacher focused on behavior management and pressed for increased skill in obedience training of the class. The cooperating teacher's journal expressed her frustration with the lack of time for working with the student teacher. She did not seem to feel that the communication between the two of them was as open as it might be, stating at one point that although the student teacher had said that she wanted to continue with the research study "I'm not sure she'd tell me if she didn't." The student teacher cried--a lot. But she was very positive in her rating of the cooperating teacher on all points, indicating that the cooperating teacher had been helpful, supportive, and encouraging. Throughout the semester the student teacher frequently said

"O.K." or "right." In the 14 recorded conferences, between September 25 and November 24, the student teacher made a total of 934 verbal statements to her cooperating teacher. Three hundred twenty seven of these statements were simply "O.K." or "right."

The student teacher reported that she had been less able to handle behavior problems and relate personally to the students than she had expected, but she felt that she had estaolished herself as a teacher better than she had expected. Her expressed satisfaction with the experience was about the mean of the RITE study sample (Hughes, R., & Hukill, H., Note 10).

The cooperating teacher reported that she had spent more time than she had expected planning lessons with the student teacher and she felt that the student teacher was less prepared for the student teaching experience than she had expected her to be. When asked about her primary responsibility as a cooperating teacher she reported that it was "to help the student teacher learn that she can solve her own problems. Not only right now, but in the future, in teaching."

The first recorded conference between the cooperating teacher and the student teacher occurred at the end of the first three weeks. The cooperating teacher noted in her journal that it was a rather significant day:

> We were having an Instructional Feedback Conference, taping, too. I was just showing (student teacher) the data that I'd gathered on off-task behaviors that she'd listed as concerns when (student teacher) reached over, turned off the tape and cried. I certainly didn't insist on taping again right then...I tried to use my best listening skills, but she couldn't or didn't choose to articulate clearly what the problem was.

The conference itself provides little clue as to the source of the tears but it did show relatively clearly the method which the cooperating teacher used

to direct the activity of the student teacher. The cooperating teacher instructed the student teacher to "come up with a concern, something that bothered you about the pupils' behavior, something that makes you feel uncomfortable or that you would like to see changed." The cooperating teacher mapped out the following procedures.

> The first thing you are going to need to do is let me observe when you teach today..and get an idea of what is actually going on, to what extent these things are happening and in order to do that what I'll do is make a seating chart of the reading group that you are working with and tally what is going on so I could use a P for poking, a T for talking, and a W for off-task writing...So what I will do is get a measurement and then we will get back together and see to what extent this may be a concern or it might not be anymore.

The student teacher said, "O.K."

A few days later the cooperating teacher and student teacher conferenced regarding the student teacher's concern about student behavior. Both wrote in their journals on that day. The cooperating teacher began the conference by asking the student teacher if the students' poking and talking and writing were still a concern for her. The student teacher responded, "No, not so much. They are not so bad about that anymore." The cooperating teacher then began to probe for another concern on which to focus. With this prodding the student teacher suggested that off-task behavior during the last ten minutes of class might be a problem. The cooperating teacher followed her training format: "What I can do as far as totaling the data right here is put number of off-task behavior per one minute. I observed for seven minutes. And what I can do is get a rate per minute per average. If you want a total for later on." The cooperating teacher pushed for specificity, for the student teacher

to "state the behavior" to tell her "What sort of things (students) do that I could observe." The student teacher suggested, "Oh, talking, wiggling." The conference, like most of the others which were recorded, followed the pattern of the cooperating teacher pushing the student teacher to select and state a "concern" which she "wanted to work on" in regard to classroom practice, and to describe the concern in terms of specific student behaviors which the cooperating teacher could observe and factor in a tally and frequency table. The focus of instruction and guidance for the student teacher then would be either the extinction or reduction of undesirable student behaviors or the introduction or increase of desired student behaviors. Selected behaviors were specific, discrete and limited. Success of the student teacher performance could then be determined by the increase or decrease of the stated behaviors. The cooperating teacher seemed most pleased and complimentary of the student teacher for buying into this system she regarded as a "problem solving approach."

Regarding the conference and the "concern" on which they were focusing, the student teacher wrote:

> (We) had a conference over my concerns. My biggest concern is losing the group's attention--it starts dwindling away towards the end. So (cooperating teacher) is keeping a tally of student behaviors, wiggling-talking-playing (off-task behavior), for the last 10 minutes of each time. I think if they were involved in more challenging work they wouldn't be bored like this.

One month into the experience the student teacher wrote that the kids in her reading group were still having behavior problems. "My teacher took a tally. It was pretty bad--awful! I really think their work is too easy for

them. They've all had these skills before." The cooperating teacher's journal presented a different perspective:

> student teacher was in tears again today. I'm worried and will speak with her university supervisor. We were doing an evaluation conference and she said she thought the number estimated..was looking terrible...I believe I've given her very specific directions about improving classroom control...and urged her again to copy the list I use that lists skills for behavior management. I'd given this to her before but she'd forgotten to copy it. I know I've mentioned its importance several times. She (student teacher) changed her concern in conferences a couple of times so we haven't progressed to actually seeing some changes. Next week should see some real progress if she follows plans to change pupils calling out. I think she'll feel better when she sees she has a hand on pupil behavior. She did finally express her frustration with the kids' conduct with her.

The concluding exchange between the cooperating teacher and student teacher during the conference seemed indicative of both the focus and the problem of the student teaching experience. The cooperating teacher had gone over the evaluation with the student teacher and emphasized the need for improvement in the area of "behavioral management," then asked the student teacher "How do you feel about this, your evaluation?" The student teacher responded, "The thing about behavioral management...just really crack down?" The cooperating teacher answered, "It seems to be something that you have been aware of."

When the student teacher failed to demonstrate the desired degree of control the cooperating teacher became more direct and descriptive in her feedback.

Cooperating teacher (CT):

Are you basically a person that doesn't like to give orders? Doesn't like to get tough with people?

Student teacher (ST):

I guess.

CT: That's unfortunately part of this job. . . . It's more of being able to speak in an authoritative tone, like "You need to take your seat right now." Practice that. Practice that with a tape recorder. Just in your own privacy practice saying things like that and then listen and see if that sounds like a person you'd obey.

CT: I think as you teach more and you're with the kids more, I think you'll get fed up faster with some of the stuff that's going on. You'll get fed up with it and realize that you're gonna have to eliminate it.

CT: We're not expecting perfection. My gosh, I certainly don't have perfect classroom management but it's acceptable and I'm afraid what you've got right now is not minimally acceptable, it's just...the kids would run over you.

CT: It (student teaching) is the big time, you know, and you haven't been prepared for it by your observations at all. I mean it just didn't help. It helped maybe understanding how to teach somebody something which is nice...It's crowd control type stuff that we're doing here. Whereas I think some of the techniques that you've

using with the kids are the kind that work beautifully if you've got four or five kids.

CT: Unfortunately, the behavior management is the big thing that principals look at so you really want to get that up there especially in the special education because you're going to have the kids in special ed that are often a problem.

CT: You might have to take away some privilege or, you know, have something...use marbles or use whatever that you can kinda hold over their heads as a whole group...

And in her journal the student teacher expressed her frustration and determination in terms of the training outcomes as she had come to perceive them.

> Tuesday was awful. My score for behavior management was below minimally acceptable. The kids were running all over me & I was letting them get away with it. So on Wednesday I was firm and they were 99% better! I was happy, (cooperating teacher) was happy & so was (university supervisor). I can't relax a bit. I've got to stay on my toes & show them that I mean business 100% of the time! Those kids (the problem ones) are NOT going to ruin my student teaching experience!

Despite the problems that appear in the journals and conferences, the evaluation of the student teacher's performance at mid-term indicated that the student teacher was making satisfactory progress in her training. "Not great," the student teacher wrote in her journal, "but at least it wasn't just terrible!" Again she focused on classroom management, writing, "I've got to

improve in classroom management. I've got to get tough & firm! It's the only way I'll survive."

Case Study #3

Both the cooperating teacher and the student teacher were strong personalities, sure of the "rightness" of their own perceptions, positions, and behaviors, and confident of their own ability and competency. They shared a period of time together and focused on the completion of tasks assigned by role to each, with the student teacher functioning and reacting more as a "peer" role member of the dyad than as a "trainee."

On-going entries in the journals of the student teacher provided insight into both her confidence and her strong position in the dyad. These entries, along with her statements in both conferences and interviews, evinced a strong orientation toward an absolute and simplistic authority-based "right-wrong, good-bad" world view along with an equally strong belief in the direct and protective personal intervention of God on her behalf.

The cooperating teacher held equally strong and clear perceptions of what was "right" and what "should" be done or not done. She gave unquestioning respect to "authority" and gave and demanded "respect" in her encounters with both the university supervisor and the student teacher.

The cooperating teacher was cordial, capable, and highly organized, placing great emphasis on details associated with any given task. The cooperating teacher's method or "manner" of relating, which she described as "honest and open" often seemed to distress the student teacher. The student teacher was clearly ambivalent about the nature of the cooperating teacher's feedback. In one journal entry made during the first month the student teacher wrote "She is really honest and I appreciate the feedback she gives me" and "Even though her comments are not negative I believe she could put

them in a more positive way." In a later entry the student teacher noted that the cooperating teacher "is so honest which I appreciate, but she doesn't always say things real tactful." Still later the student teacher wrote that she and the cooperating teacher had had a "rather degrading discussion" in which the student teacher felt that the cooperating teacher "was being more critical than she needed to be--Believe me, she didn't encourage me."

In her first interview conducted by RITE the student teacher said that she felt the cooperating teacher was "ideal" because she was "honest" and because on the first day the cooperating teacher "wrote out my expectations" so she knew what she would be doing week by week. The student teacher also stated in the same interview that she would be able to know how she performed as a student teacher because the cooperating teacher would "let me know and I wouldn't ask for anything more." But at the mid-semester interview the student teacher stated that when the cooperating teacher said things with which she did not agree she did not listen because "I don't want to pick up things that are not good for me." Additional comments of the student teacher during this interview emphasized the ambivalence of her feelings toward the cooperating teacher.

> She's very critical. She's a very constructive person, but she's not very warm...when she tells me the good things I've done and then turns around...and doesn't put it constructively it breaks down. I just don't want to get close to a person like that...I've realized that's the way she is. She's not an ogre, really she isn't...I don't agree with everything she says but she has been good to me...She's been pretty helpful. She's given me a lot of feedback. I've taken it. Yesterday she gave me some feedback and I wanted to throw it back in her face. That's a bad attitude...My attitude was that I know how to teach. I

don't need this criticism...I don't mean to brag by any means, but I feel like I know what I did wrong and I know what I could've improved.

In the final interview at the end of the experience the student teacher continued to express both views. She was positive about her experience and training, felt the cooperating teacher had given her many good suggestions, had always told her when she "did wrong or right" and had showed the student teacher how she "really was as a teacher." On the other hand, reported the student teacher, one of the things which she valued least about the experience was "some of the remarks made by the cooperating teacher," adding "If I don't agree with them I wouldn't take them."

The cooperating teacher appeared to look upon the student teacher more as a peer than as a "trainee." She was highly complimentary of her intelligence, ability, confidence, and performance in all areas. In the mid-semester interview with the RITE staff member, the cooperating teacher said that she found it difficult to think of the student teacher as a "student" as she was so capable. In the final interview the cooperating teacher reported that the student teacher was not "typical" but had come to the classroom "much better prepared than many other student teachers I've had in the past." On a number of occasions the cooperating teacher commented that the student teacher was her "right-hand man" and that working with her was like having another teacher in the classroom rather than a student teacher in training. However, the student teacher felt that the cooperating teacher had not provided personal encouragement for her.

On the self-perception (self-concept) inventory instrument used by RITE, the cooperating teacher and student teacher marked themselves in a highly positive manner. They saw themselves as "strict" and both considered this a positive rather than a negative trait.

Eighteen days after the student teacher began work with the class, the cooperating teacher wrote that the student teacher had "exhibited excellent teaching ability thus far," noting she was "mature, organized, conscientious and thoughtful," and had become a "natural" part of the class. On the same date, the student teacher wrote in her journal that she was having problems with the "lower" group, perhaps because "they just don't listen." She wrote that she found working with the "high" group much more enjoyable but that she was beginning to realize from feedback from the cooperating teacher that she needed to call on students from the lower group more often. "I guess I'm afraid they won't be able to answer any of my questions so I just skip over them. However, I'm seeing that when I do call on them, many times it gets them back on task."

The student teacher at this point expressed only positive reaction to the "feedback" she was receiving from the cooperating teacher.

> Cooperating teacher is providing me with anecdotal records three times a week which I am finding real helpful. She is really honest, and I really appreciate the feedback she gives.

A phenomenon appears at this point which continues throughout the training period and which is absent from the other relationships. The student teacher verbalizes her evaluative impressions of her observations of the cooperating teacher, apparently using criteria which she feels characterizes "good" teaching and upon which she relies in asserting at a later point that she knows how to teach and how to evaluate and correct her own classroom performance. She had observed the cooperating teacher conduct a lesson on change in which the cooperating teacher had the kids jump up and down in their chairs to see how their pulse would change. The student teacher considered

the activity too noisy and noted "I really think there would of been something better."

Two factors appear to converge to generate "training" activities in this dyad: the peer status accorded the student teacher and the importance each of the participants places on the successful completion of assigned role responsibilities--the sense of supererogation as a virtue. Statements and actions indicate that both the cooperating teacher and student teacher consider the performance level of the student teacher at the beginning of the experience equal to that expected of a beginning teacher. At the same time each appears anxious to fulfill the obligations of her job, to do well at what is expected of her as a function of her job. What emerges, then, is an alternation of peer level sharing based on the assertion that the student teacher possessed prior to the training period those skills one is expected to acquire during the clinical experience, and periodic instances of what the cooperating teacher terms "nit-picking" in which she engages in minute criticism which the student teacher considers unjustified.

In her journal the cooperating teacher noted that the student teacher "continued to do a fine job in every aspect of her teaching" and then wrote: "Today I asked her not to chew gum in front of the students. She blushed and said, 'Oh, my gosh, would you believe I'm chewing a fingernail!" Five days later the cooperating teacher wrote that the student teacher "appeared very worn" and that she was "picking up" that the week's responsibilities "are bothersome trivia keeping her busy when she'd rather devote all her energy to the next two weeks," which would be the total teach time. Two days later the cooperating teacher wrote that she had had a "long talk" with the student teacher and "expressed many of my concerns of late--specifically her lax attitude with much negative body language coming across to the students." The

student teacher had told a student "Oh, bull, that is not correct," and "had rolled her eyes" and "almost looked disgusted" at certain student responses. The cooperating teacher reported that she had told the student teacher that she was a role model kids look up to and that she needed to portray a positive attitude. The cooperating teacher concluded the journal entry with the comment that after she had "lowered the boom" there was a "remarkable change" and the student teacher had an excellent day with "very productive lessons."

At the final evaluation the cooperating teacher continued to emphasize the fact that although the student teacher "worked all semester to improve her body language and attitude reflected in facial expressions...that is something she will always need to be aware of."

The student teacher reported on a problem she had had in teaching a lesson. "I taught pendulums again and the kids played with them like they were toys." The cooperating teacher wrote in a journal entry about the same time,

> (Student teacher) had another fine morning of teaching! She is such a natural teacher. I explained to her that if I seem "picky" at times it is because there is nothing major to correct. I asked if my "little corrections" were taken in the manner they were given--as only helpful hints. She told me at first they were not but now she understands and appreciates my comments. For example, I suggested she not mark all over students' papers when grading. We talked about it and she worked out the reasons why I'd made the suggestions.

The final evaluation of the student teacher was highly positive. The cooperating teacher wrote that the student teacher was "a natural teacher, competent in planning, lesson implementation, classroom management, energetic,

dependable, creative, and works well with children." She felt that the student teacher would be an "asset to any faculty."

Discussion of Findings

Because no one data source can present a complete representation of an area as large as the supervision of student teachers, this paper has combined two approaches. First an overview of the content of supervisory conferences conducted by the entire intensive sample of 20 cooperating teachers and their student teachers was provided. These conferences were described in terms of the process of the verbal interactions as well as the content of those interactions. In addition three cooperating teacher-student teacher dyads were selected for intensive investigation via a case study approach. Analysis of multiple data sources helped provide detailed pictures of the supervision of these three student teachers.

Findings drawn from case studies and from the supervisory conferences were, for the most part, consistent. Cooperating teachers and student teachers seem to pay little attention to any set of specified lesson objectives and consequently to the evaluation of lessons. Across all conferences and case studies, cooperating teachers tended to dominate conversations. Student teachers often simply acknowledged what the cooperating teacher had said. Finally, all conferences and case studies indicate a primary concern with methods and materials of instruction for use in the immediate context.

The following conclusions, suggested by the frequency count of the categories used to analyze all supervisory conferences, were substantiated by the intensive study of the three dyads.

1. One common assumption underlies clinical teacher education: practical in-classroom experience necessarily contributes to the development of better teachers.

2. Personal qualities of the student teachers are used as indicators of success in student teaching.

3. Satisfaction, fulfillment of expectations, and satisfactory performance evaluations of the student teacher should not be assumed to indicate that the experience resulted in professional growth and the acquisition of teaching competencies.

4. There was no evidence of an articulated knowledge base regarding either the context and process of teaching or the content and process of training the student teacher.

5. Craft knowledge and "common sense" are the basis of most decisions regarding specific clinical experiences.

6. There is a lack of conceptual continuity regarding specified outcomes of student teaching.

Recommendations

Although each participant in the student teaching experience brings unique characteristics to the context of his/her clinical setting, certain themes appear to pervade all experiences. There is a focus on the methods and materials of immediate classroom teaching events with little attention to specified objectives and evaluation. More work is needed in the complex area of supervision of student teachers if we are to produce teachers who can establish successful learning environments for all types children in a variety of circumstances.

Reference Notes

1. Griffin, G., Barnes, S., Hughes, R., O'Neal, S., Defino, M., Edwards, S., & Hukill, H. Clinical preservice teacher education: Final report of a descriptive study. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983.
2. O'Neal, S.F. Supervision of student teachers: Feedback and evaluation. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1983.
3. Edwards, S. Clinical preservice activities: Education, development, and training: Three case studies. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1982.
4. Lacefield, W. E., & Cole, H. P. Starting point for curricular change: A predisposition and suitability measure for client groups. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans, February, 1973.
5. Hughes, R., Jr., Griffin, G. A., & Defino, M. E. Personality factors in the student teaching triad. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York City, March 1982.
6. MacDonald, A. P., Jr., & Tseng, M. S. Dimensions of internal versus external control revisited: Toward the development of a measure of generalized expectancy. Unpublished manuscript, West Virginia University, 1972.
7. Hunt, D. E., Greenwood, J., Noy, J. E., & Watson, J. Assessment of conceptual level: Paragraph completion method. Toronto: Ontario, Institute of Studies in Education, June 1973.
8. LaMonica, E. Construct validity of an empathy instrument. Unpublished manuscript. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1980.

9. Blumberg, A., & Kleinke, D. J. An instrument for describing the worklife of teachers. Paper presented at annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, April, 1981.

10. Hughes, R., Jr., & Hukill, H. Participant characteristics, change and outcomes in preservice clinical teacher education. Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, The Research and Development Center for Teacher Education, 1982.

References

Bloom, B. S., Engelhart, M. D., Furst, E. J., Hill, W. H., Krathwohl, D. R. Taxonomy of educational objectives: Cognitive domain. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1956.

Borgatta, F.F., & Corsini, R.J. The quick word test. Journal of Educational Research, 1969, 54, 115-119.

Fuller, F.F. Concerns of Teachers: A developmental conceptualization. American Educational Research Journal, 1969, 6, 207-226.

Soares, A.T., & Soares, L.M. Self-perceptions of student teachers and the meaningfulness of their experience. The Journal of Teacher Education, 1969, 19, 187-191.

Southall, C., & King, D. Critical incidents in student teaching. Teacher Educator, 1979, 15, 34-36.

Weller, R.H. Verbal communication in instructional supervision. New York: Teachers College Press, 1971.